

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 17 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

SYLVESTRE OSCAR, AKA Sylvestre
Blanchard,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-72142

Agency No. A209-389-228

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 14, 2021**

Before: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Sylvestre Oscar, a native and citizen of Haiti, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241 (9th Cir. 2020). We review de novo claims of due process violations in immigration proceedings. *Jiang v. Holder*, 754 F.3d 733, 738 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that the harm Oscar experienced did not rise to the level of persecution. *See Duran-Rodriguez v. Barr*, 918 F.3d 1025, 1028-29 (9th Cir. 2019) (record did not compel finding that harm rises to the level of persecution where perpetrators took no violent actions against the petitioner or his family beyond threats).

The BIA did not err in its determination that Oscar waived any challenge to the IJ’s conclusion that his proposed particular social group of “Haitians who refuse to join the gangs, or be a gang member in Haiti” is not cognizable. *See Alanniz v. Barr*, 924 F.3d 1061, 1068-69 (9th Cir. 2019) (no error in BIA’s waiver determination).

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s determination that Oscar did not otherwise establish that the harm he fears would be on account of a protected ground. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (an applicant’s “desire to be free from harassment by criminals motivated by theft or random violence by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground”).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Oscar's contentions regarding pattern or practice of persecution because he did not raise them before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review claims not presented to the agency).

To the extent Oscar contends that the BIA violated his right to due process and erred by not addressing firm resettlement, his contention fails. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach). We do not address Oscar's contentions as to the IJ's firm resettlement determination because the BIA did not deny relief on that ground. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) ("In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Thus, Oscar's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Oscar failed to show it is more likely than not he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Haiti. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.